



Golden Gate National Recreation Area

File Code:

L3215 (GOGA-PLAN)

Big Lagoon Working Group Meeting Notes December 5, 2002

Purpose of the meeting was to convene a Working Group that will provide a venue for interested parties to exchange information, clarify issues and concerns, and collaborate on creative problem solving with the National Park Service (NPS) project team on the Big Lagoon Restoration.

Meeting Agenda:

1. Start Up
2. Self Introductions
3. Expectations
4. Project Description
5. Information Exchange
6. Meeting Logistics
7. Meeting Evaluation

1. Start Up

The meeting was opened by facilitator Peg Henderson (NPS - Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program), who reviewed the meeting agenda and led the group in defining the following guidelines for this and future meetings:

- Support participation by all
- Ask for clarification when needed
- Begin and end on time
- Raise hand to speak and call on people in order
- Don't interrupt
- Finish topics and define points within a reasonable amount of time
- One conversation at time

2. Self Introductions

Everyone in the room introduced himself or herself, identified their group affiliation, if any, and briefly described why they were interested in the project. (See list of groups represented below.)

3. Expectations

The NPS project team outlined the purpose of the group as an on-going forum where interested parties can exchange and discuss information about the Big Lagoon Restoration Project and can contribute to the development of the restoration

alternatives to be carried forward and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report/Statement to be completed for the project. The NPS is looking forward to a continuing dialogue with the Working Group as the project evolves over the next year. In addition to keeping the Working Group up to date on the project phases, the team hopes to focus discussion on topics of interest to the group. The NPS team clarified that this is not a decision making group, that final decisions in the project will be made by NPS management.

Comments expressed by the group included the following (text in italics represents NPS responses to questions provided at the meeting):

- The hope that their input would not be just "window dressing." *The NPS believes that the Working Group discussions will greatly inform the project and that, as conflicts are identified, the Working Group will contribute to potential solutions.*
- That the project timeline is very short and may need to be reconsidered. *The NPS pointed out that the timeframe for the planning phase of the project was determined by the fact that certain funding sources will expire within the next year. There will be time beyond that deadline to refine the project design for the preferred alternative.*
- That information about the project and these meetings should be available in a central location. *Information will be available on the internet at www.nps.gov/goga/admin/planning and at Muir Woods.*
- Where does the "buck stop?" That is, who is empowered to make final decisions about the project. *NPS senior management will be the final decision maker. The planning process, however, will be open to and informed by the public. This Working Group is one component of public participation opportunities available for the project.*
- What happens if there is a gap in the schedule (for example, that it is discovered that a wet weather survey is needed after the rainy season)? *The NPS team has tried to plan for wet weather data collection, which is currently ongoing. Project design and construction will occur in subsequent phases, and design refinements consistent with the preferred alternative can be made at that time, if needed, based on new data.*
- There is a need for commitment to the Working Group process on the part of the NPS and the participants to ensure a continuous dialogue.
- The group should work toward consensus.

4. Project Description

NPS co-project manager Jennifer Vick presented a description of the site and the issues being addressed by the project. Questions asked by the group related to how the project goals have changed over time, the amount of wetlands being included in the project, the presence of various species, the types of resource data being collected, and how and when the data would be presented in assessments. Data are currently being collected, and initial results will be available this winter. Additional reports will become available over the next several months. Studies being conducted for the project include the following:

- Watershed sediment budget
- Surface water flow (Redwood Creek and Green Gulch tributaries)
- Groundwater elevation and salinity
- Geoarchaeological assessment (including 24 soil cores) California red-legged frog distribution, abundance, and adult migration
- Coho spawner abundance, spawning location, and rearing (reference sites)

- Riparian bird nesting surveys (PRBO)
- Wintering birds species composition
- Fish species composition
- COE jurisdictional delineation

Some attendees expressed interest in seeing the scope of work for the sediment budget analysis being contracted by the NPS. Jennifer Vick will provide copies to interested individuals.

Information Exchange

There was a general consensus that the group would like to see a listing of the studies being done, the study schedule, and study status. There was also agreement that everyone needs to have a baseline understanding of site conditions and issues. To help set the framework for future discussions, the NPS will focus their next several presentations on historical and current conditions on the site. Topics for the next three meetings are:

- January – study timeline, geology, hydrology and geomorphology;
- February - biological resources; and
- March - visitor use, parking, and traffic.

5. Meeting Logistics

The participants agreed that future meetings should be held on Thursday evenings, preferably at a location further south than tonight's meeting (the Marin Civic Center).

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, January 16, 7-9 PM, location to be determined.

6. Meeting Evaluation

At the end of the meeting the participants were asked what they liked about this evenings meeting, and what they would like to see changed. Comments are shown in the table below:

Liked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilitation • if no introductions, then name tags with organization or company • meeting notice in the Marin Independent Journal • good outreach, continue it • food 	Change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no introductions • provide a list of attendees • introduce new people • more timely notice • more handouts • no cross talking • location further south
---	---

Miscellaneous Follow-up Items

- Post the 1994 Environmental Assessment on the website.
- Send sediment budget scope of work to interested participants.
- Identify a more southern meeting location.
- Provide more detailed schedule at the next meeting.

Meeting Attendees

Thirty people attended the meeting. Attendees included those representing themselves as individuals and those representing groups or agencies. In addition to those representing themselves as individuals, the following groups and agencies were represented among the attendees:

- Alto Bowl Horse Owners Association
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- California Native Plant Society
- Environmental Action Committee of West Marin
- Golden Gate National Parks Association
- Marin Audubon Society
- Marin Conservation League
- Marin County Supervisors
- Miwok Valley Stables
- Mt. Tam Interpretive Association
- Muir Beach Community Services District
- Muir Woods Community Association
- National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- Ocean Riders
- San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Sierra Club
- Tamalpais Conservation Club
- The Bay Institute